
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:13-cv-1390-JLS-ANx

Date: May 11, 2017

Title: Preslie Hardwick v. County of Orange, et al.

Present: **Honorable JOSEPHINE L. STATON, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

Terry Guerrero
Deputy Clerk

N/A
Court Reporter

ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR PLAINTIFF: ATTORNEYS PRESENT FOR DEFENDANT:

Not Present

Not Present

**PROCEEDINGS: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY
PLAINTIFF’S AMENDED PROPOSED FINAL PRETRIAL
CONFERENCE ORDER SHOULD NOT BE STRICKEN (Doc.
122-1)**

The parties appeared before this Court on April 28, 2017 for their final pretrial conference. (Minutes, Doc. 121.) At the conference, Plaintiff requested leave to amend the parties’ proposed final pretrial conference order in order to include statements pertaining to misrepresentations and omissions Defendants allegedly made on March 31, 2000 that contributed to Defendants’ alleged violation of Plaintiff’s Fourth and Fourteenth Amendment rights. The Court granted Plaintiff leave to file an amended proposed final pretrial conference order consistent with Plaintiff’s representations at the final pretrial conference.

Later that same day, Plaintiff lodged her amended proposed order. (Amended Proposed Order, Doc. 122-1.) On May 3, 2017, Defendants filed their objections to Plaintiff’s proposed order. (Objections, Doc. 124.) Upon comparing the Plaintiff’s proposed order with the parties’ original proposed order, the Court finds several differences between the two that go beyond the scope of the Court’s leave to amend. For example, Plaintiff has re-drafted language under “Claim 1” of the proposed order in the section pertaining to the “elements of liability required to establish Plaintiff’s claims.” (*Compare* Proposed Order at 5, Doc. 109-1 *with* Amended Proposed Order at 5.) Plaintiff has also deleted the section, “Defendants’ Position on Plaintiff’s Statement of Claims,” in the amended order and changed the list of depositions that will be lodged with the Clerk. (*Compare* Proposed Order at 8–9, 14 *with* Amended Proposed Order at 8, 13–14.) Even where Plaintiff has included language regarding Defendants’ misrepresentations and omissions on March 31, 2000, the Court notes that Plaintiff did

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 8:13-cv-1390-JLS-ANx

Date: May 11, 2017

Title: Preslie Hardwick v. County of Orange, et al.

not merely add this language to the proposed order but replaced and modified language that had previously been in its place. (*Compare* Proposed Order at 5–6 *with* Amended Proposed Order at 6.)

Therefore, Plaintiff is hereby ORDERED to show cause in writing no later than **Tuesday, May 16, 2017**, why the Court should not strike her amended proposed order. Plaintiff's response to this OSC shall include a redlined version of the amended order, showing all the changes from the parties' original proposed order, and explain Plaintiff's reasons for each change. No oral argument on this matter will be heard unless ordered by the Court. The Order to Show Cause will stand submitted upon the filing of Plaintiff's response.

Initials of Preparer: tg